

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-12 and 15-20 are all the claims pending in the application.

Claims 1, 2, 4-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Toy et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,192,115; hereinafter “Toy”) in view of Koster (U.S. Pat. No. 6,259,914). Claims 9, 10, 15 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Toy in view of Koster and in further view of Dunn et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,138,008; hereinafter “Dunn”). Claims 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Toy in view of Koster and in further view of Asano et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,991,721; hereinafter “Asano”). Claims 17-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Koster in view of Frey et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,535,596; hereinafter “Frey”). Applicant traverses these claim rejections.

Independent claim 1 recites, in part:

a mode changing unit that changes a mode of a connection between said caller terminal and said mobile station from a conversation mode to a text-based mail sending mode upon receiving a request from said caller terminal[.]

Claim 1 thus requires, *inter alia*, a mode changing unit that changes a mode of a connection between said caller terminal and said mobile station from a conversation mode to a text-based mail sending mode upon receiving a request from said caller terminal.

The Examiner asserts that Dunn teaches this feature, and points to col. 1, lines 24-25 and col. 5, lines 47-51 in support of his position. However, the cited portions only refer to a voicemail feature, not a text-based mail sending feature as claim 1 requires. Furthermore, none


of the other cited references cure this deficiency. Therefore, Applicant submits that the cited references fail to teach or suggest all of the claimed features of independent claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 1 is patentable over the cited references for at least these reasons. Further, since independent claim 17 recites features similar to claim 1, Applicant submits that claim 17 is patentable for reasons analogous to those stated above with regard to claim 1. Finally, Applicant submits that dependent claims 2, 4-12 and 18-20 are patentable over the cited references at least by virtue of their respective dependency on claims 1 and 17.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,


Howard L. Bernstein
Registration No. 25,665

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 5, 2006